

**REMARKS**

The Office Action mailed October 6, 2005 has been carefully considered.  
Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

**Rejection(s) Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1, 2, 4-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Basso et al. (2002/0124262) in view of Wilkins (U.S. pat. no. 5,446,919). Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Basso et al. in view of Wilkins, and further in view of Roe et al. (U.S. pat. no. 6,792,615).

Minor changes to claim 1 have been made in order to improve readability without narrowing the scope of the claim. Claim 1, from which the remaining claims depend, recites, inter alia,

... an IP wrapper circuit functioning to receive said MPEG packets from said plurality of video servers and said hard disk array and encapsulate them in IP multicast packets and encapsulate the IP multicast packets in local area network (LAN) packets having station addresses that correspond to said program identifier data and supplying said LAN packets to said switch;

Contrary to the assertion in the Office Action, this feature is not disclosed in Basso et al. or Wilkins. The Office Action points to FIGS. 4-8 and paragraphs [0055]-[0056] and [0066]-[0070] in Basso et al. as showing this feature. However, there is no mention in these portions of Basso et al. of an IP wrapper circuit functioning in the manner described above. FIGS. 4-8 are devoid of such teachings. Paragraphs [0055]-[0056] relate to retrieval of content by the RTSP proxy, and to content manipulation as handled by storage managers 206. This manipulation for instance involves the way in which content is added to or removed from content stores 204, or to providing information regarding content availability and content addresses (URLs) so that clients can properly request the content. Paragraph [0066] relates to receipt and handling of content by

the client software. For example, RTP encapsulation is stripped from MPEG streams, and the streams are stored in a ring buffer 413. Paragraphs [0067]-[0070] elaborate on the makeup and operation of the RTSP server 510, and on how the media manager 501, to which requests are passed, interacts with backend servers to meet the requests.

It will be recalled that according to the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (M.P.E.P.),

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in the applicant's disclosure.<sup>1</sup>

In this case, the combination of Basso et al., Wilkins, and Rowe et al., even if proper, fails to meet the third criterion above as such a combination would not “teach or suggest all the claim limitations.” The obviousness rejection of claims 1-9 based on Basso et al., Wilkins and Rowe et al. is therefore improper and withdrawal of same is respectfully requested.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the preceding discussion, Applicants respectfully urge that the claims of the present application define patentable subject matter and should be passed to allowance.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone call would help advance prosecution of the present invention, the Examiner is kindly invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number below.


---

<sup>1</sup> M.P.E.P § 2143.

Please charge any additional required fees, including those necessary to obtain extensions of time to render timely the filing of the instant Amendment and/or Reply to Office Action, or credit any overpayment not otherwise credited, to our deposit account no. 50-1698.

Respectfully submitted,  
THELEN REID & PRIEST, L.L.P.

Dated: April 6, 2006

  
Khaled Shami  
Reg. No. 38,745

Thelen Reid & Priest LLP  
P.O. Box 640640  
San Jose, CA 95164-0640  
Tel. (408) 282-1855  
Fax. (408) 287-8040